Vol. X, No. 52 HUMAN EVENTS December 30, 1953

THE REPUBLICAN REVOLUTION

By SENATOR WILLIAM E. JENNER OF INDIANA

IN A FEW DAYS we shall enter upon the second year of the Administration elected in the popular uprising of 1952. It is a good time to take the measure of our achievements and also of the work that remains to be done.

First, we can be grateful to our President for restoring once again the dignity of our National Government. The American people will tolerate levity from their movie stars and baseball heroes, but they want dignity in public office.

The return to good taste in the present administration is as welcome as the return to quiet at a concert after a noisy vulgar group has taken itself off. A political party which prefers good taste cannot boast of its achievements. Those who are so inclined can brag of their determination to "crack down" on their fellow citizens. But those who create must work quietly, and depend on the intelligence of the voters to recognize the change. That recognition will surely be forthcoming.

The Eisenhower Administration has made another important change. It has put competent men into Government again. For twenty years our public affairs were directed by men skilled in promises. We are replacing them with men skilled in performance. This too is an old-fashioned idea. When we operated under the Constitution, with a strictly limited Government, most of our men of talent turned to fields where rewards depended on achievement, and where incompetence was rewarded by displacement. For twenty years, however, we were governed mostly by men who had failed in the world of achievement.

A quiet, dignified Administration staffed by men with long records of achievement has already tackled difficult problems. We have a Secretary of Agriculture who knows it is a lie to promise farmers that they can for long be paid more than their crops are worth to others, by gifts from the public treasury. We have a Secretary of the Interior who knows that so-called "public power" was really the build-up of a vast political machine designed to give the Government a monopoly of industrial capital and return the socialists regularly to office.

Our Secretary of Treasury knows the fallacy of the New Deal's "low interest rates". That was a political booby trap which permitted the Federal Government to borrow vast amounts of capital it never intended to pay back. Secretary Humphrey is confronted with difficulties attendant to the return to sound policies. First, he must clean up the economic debris of twenty years of socialist mis-government with its Communist inner core. He has inherited an overhang of a hundred billion of spending which has been "charged", so to speak, by his predecessors, but not yet billed. That outstanding charge account, of more

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than a year's total tax income, has made it difficult for the Republicans to reduce taxes as fast as we hoped; but a big step has been taken on the road to economic unity.

We have a Secretary of Defense skilled in the national art of organizing men and money and machines, science and invention and daring, into a team to produce a continuing flow of goods more abundant than any nation's workers have ever produced before. Our enemies know, if we do not, that when this American productive genius is applied to military needs, it gives our fighting men a wealth of weapons no other nation can match.

THE OUTSTANDING achievement of the Eisenhower Administration has however, been little noticed. One of the first acts of the new President was to set about replacing the Joint Chiefs of Staff who had permitted the loss of China and the stalemate of Korea with a new Joint Chiefs who have the ability to devise the best military strategy for the age we live in, and the patriotism to insist that that strategy could not be modified by political servitors of the Soviet Government.

For twelve years the United States had a military program subservient to the Acheson State Department. This was deliberately mis-called subordination of the military to the political arm. It was no such thing. There has never been an American general or admiral who questioned the principle that top military policies must be subordinate to our political principles. That is unchallenged constitutional doctrine.

Harry Hopkins and Dean Acheson asserted a quite different principle. They asserted the right to establish a secret American foreign policy, which committed us to World Government without the consent of the American people. Then they demanded that the military make no proposals which would interfere with their plan for entangling us in a world super-state, where American interests no longer counted and defeat was almost preferable to victory. A long succession of great American admirals and generals, men like Densfeld, MacArthur, Wedemeyer and Van Fleet, were retired or transferred to "Siberia" or left broken-hearted and useless, to feed the colossal egotism of these political adventurers.

We cannot ask President Eisenhower to do anything more important for our country than he has done in freeing the Defense Department and the Joint Chiefs of Staff from the machinations of the socialist-minded one-worlders who distorted our State Department. The President has appointed the best military men and given them what they must have, direct access to him, so they can give without hesitation their honest professional judgment about what is best for the safety of our country.

In fairness we should give Senator Taft his share of the credit for insisting that this was the most important of all reforms. That, however, takes nothing of the credit from President Eisenhower for choosing the same course.

IT IS IMPORTANT to those of us in Congress engaged in investigating Communist penetration within our borders that we now have an Attorney General who will vigorously prosecute every violator of the existing laws against subversion. We know, as Mr. Brownell has said, that our legal powers for indictment and punishment of traitors, spies and saboteurs is far from complete. Completion of the system of legal powers is the work of Congress, but vigorous enforcement of existing laws is the share of the partnership carried by the Attorney-General. Alien Communists are being rounded up, the Subversive

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Activities Control Board is being energized, and old records left to gather dust are being opened for evidence that will cause at least a few of the betrayers of our country to spend a while in jail.

Attorney-General Brownell has done another important service. He has turned the searchlight of truth on the secret area at the very top of our executive establishment where someone made the decision to disregard the reports of J. Edgar Hoover. The American people have been deeply confused by the fact that the FBI had full information about Communists and their subversion of our institutions, but the top officials never acted on it. This gap was cleverly used by pro-Communist publicists to "prove" that the accused must be innocent, or "the FBI would have punished them". We in Congress knew of the dark administrative area, above the FBI, where the hush-hush decisions to protect the traitors were made, but we could get no proof.

Now we have an Attorney-General who is trying to uncover the story. We know now where the most important FBI reports on subversion in Government departments were sent. We know the reports were received. Democratic officials who have testified before our Committees were shocked by these reports, as all good citizens would be. But somewhere, in the darkness which still covers the operations of Cabinet officers and White House officials in the Truman regime, someone was able to prevent the dismissal of these traitors and even to insist on their promotion. We do not have the full story yet, but by cooperation between the Attorney-General and Congress we shall find the man who was powerful enough to block the recommendations of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury and an Assistant Attorney-General, and to protect subordinates who had been faithful to the Soviet Union.

If the Eisenhower Administration has done so mhuch, what remains to be done? Obviously much remains to be learned about the full story of Communist subversion in Government, but that is well under way. The great task of the Republican regime — the promise most important to the voters in 1952 — is the task of making a new American foreign policy, one wholly untainted by Hopkins, Acheson, Hiss and Harry White, a foreign policy which will never again assume that a stalemate is a substitute for victory.

I do not put that task first, however, in my outlook for 1954. Preceding the work of making a new American foreign policy is another problem. Neither the present Administration, nor any Government we can elect, is ever going to make a sound foreign policy or a sound economic, financial and tax program, until we make one other change. We must return unreservedly to the principle of local self-government and states' rights, on which all representative government rests. We must complete the constitutional revolution President Eisenhower has already begun.

Before we can solve the great problem of foreign policy in this dangerous and disorganized world, Congress must give back to private industry, to private reform and private

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

education, and to local government, *every* activity which can be surrendered by the Federal Government. We must adopt as our first principle the total dismantling of that Colossus on the Potomac, the Welfare State, erected by the New Dealers who controlled the Democratic Party, not to help the poor, but to give themselves absolute irresistible power.

The one result the Welfare State never achieves is welfare. It gives people more dollars to handle by making each dollar worth less and less. Dismantling the Welfare State is the essential step to true welfare for the people, as it is the essential step in preserving our liberty.

The Federal Government today has about two and a half million employees, not including the military. No Government can direct a bureaucracy of two and a half million obedient servants and remain free. The Federal Government has a budget of about 85 billions. No Government can spend any such share of the national income from one single center and preserve an economy in which the people can remain free men. The budget and the bureaucracy are power over you and me. They must be demobilized.

The President has appointed a commission under a distinguished citizen of Indiana, Dean Clarence Manion, to report on the core of this very proposal — to decide what powers and duties shall be reserved to the States, and what taxes shall be relinquished to the States, so they can carry on their Constitutional duties. This will be, I am sure, a good report. Other committees are working on other aspects of the overriding issue — the return of our Federal Government to its Constitutional role.

I say this is the number one responsibility before Congress, to restore limited government and revitalize all the forms of private and local initiative and voluntary cooperation which made our Nation great.

About twelve years ago, Judge Hatton Summers, a distinguished Congressman from Texas, and long Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, warned, in an article in the *Readers Digest,* that Congress would never be able to keep its Constitutional role unless it cut away most of the extraneous problems belonging to local and private agencies, which the New Deal had forced on it, not unintentionally.

It is equally true that the executive branch cannot preserve its Constitutional role unless present responsibilities for local and private action are contracted. Under the Constitution, our executive is directed by an elected president and his personal appointees. Under a Welfare State, the bureaucracy (not responsible to the voters) becomes more and more intrenched and absorbs both legislative and executive functions from elected officials.

Now is the time for Congress and the Administration to complete the restoration of States' rights, of local and private self-government, so well begun by President Eisenhower. Then we shall be free to make a foreign policy, a military policy and an economic policy that will carry us forward as a nation to heights not yet imagined.

Additional Copies: 6—1.00; 10—1.50; 50—5.50; 100—10.00; 500—15.00; 1,000—25.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Volume X, No. 52 Wednesday, December 30, 1953 Washington, D. C.

Irrepressible Conflict: Pro-American groups plan a "march on Washington" late in January to demand passage of the Bricker Amendment; meanwhile (in the past 24 hours) the Attorney General met with Bricker and other Senate leaders to talk about a "compromise amendment".

Almost simultaneously, in New York (where else could it happen?) well-known partisans of internationalism have announced the formation of a committee to defeat the Bricker Amendment, under the title "Committee for Defense of the Constitution by Preserving the Treaty Power". Co-chairmen are John W. Davis, Wall Street lawyer and famous backer of internationalist causes, and General Lucius Clay, former commander in Germany.

It is worthy of note that among those who helped form this committee is Mr. Arthur J. Goldsmith, once active promoter of the Committee for National Affairs which fought what they called "isolationism" and helped in the defeat of Senator Burton K. Wheeler of Montana in 1946; and which also fought the election (but unsuccessfully) of Senator Pat McCarran of Nevada. Columnist Westbrook Pegler has been attacking Mr. Goldsmith for some time.

Formation of the committee to fight the Bricker Amendment and its complexion reminds some observers here of the William Allen White Committee to Defend America by Aiding Britain in 1941, which helped to get the U.S. into World War II. That committee stressed the danger to the U.S. of aggression against us by Hitler Germany. As we go to press, there comes a public announcement by two U.S. Army official historians, Setson Conn and Louis Morton, who say that Germany had no aggressive intentions towards the U.S. before the attack on Pearl Harbor (*New York Times*, December 30, page 5, City edition). Food for thought and possibly some regrets.

But the internationalists are tireless. We learn, additionally, of the preparation for a "committee for collective security" under formation by some of the same New York internationalists. Mr. Goldsmith admits in a telephone conversation with us that he is also a member of the "collective security" group which, however, he said, is so far only "tentative". He confirmed the statement of methods, and the slogan of the group which we read him from a copy of a confidential memo on the matter which had fallen into our hands. The projected slogan is "the only alternative to collective security is universal insecurity". The methods: "Promotion of national policies and projects which further its objectives by informing, mobilizing and channeling public opinion and by aiding the election to national office of individuals who uphold its aims." This means going into the constituencies to fight "isolationist" candidates.

We see no reason why Mr. Goldsmith and others should not do this. The only thing we fail to understand is why their opponents do not pursue the same method. Perhaps they will. In any case, it looks like 1954 will be a very forensic year.

Bipartisan: When the President summoned both Democratic and Republican leaders of Congress to a bipartisan conference on legislation, we got a certain veteran Republican member of Congress to comment. We sought to obtain a really realistic viewpoint and to pierce through the fog of altruistic and "high-minded" editorial comment which enveloped the President's proposal. Our friend said:

"It's just a quote noble unquote gesture and the White House will probably rue it later. When you call in Rayburn and John McCormack to such a conference you can't assume — as the papers seem to do

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

— that they'll really cooperate. Their business as leaders of the Democrats is to put the Republican leadership in the hole as often as possible. They may say they'll cooperate on this or that, but in the long run their partisan considerations will prevail.

"If Ike wants to get a better understanding between the White House and the Hill", he went on, "before starting legislation rolling, he would do better to call a conference of the Chairmen of the committees, House and Senate. On taxes, defense spending, housing and a dozen other issues, he could get really expert technical opinions about the chances of bills in each field. And that's better than calling in Speaker Joe Martin and Floor Leader Halleck."

Another member noted the great "gush" of copy in eastern "liberal" papers about the necessity of the Administration getting Democratic support for legislation in view of the narrow voting margin on a partisan basis. He said: "What these liberal rags want is cooperation between the small number of Republican 'liberal' members and the Democratic New Dealers. That's their definition of 'bipartisan'. You don't catch them talking about the bipartisan coalition between Southern conservative Democrats and Northern GOP conservatives which has existed for years and has passed and maintained such laws as the Taft-Hartley Labor Act, and the McCarran Immigration Act, and in the last session it produced significant votes against foreign aid. Let's get this straight — what kind of bipartisanism do you mean when you throw that term around?"

Not Merely Gossip: Over holiday party tables, there has been much talk about an imminent change — possibly the first — in the President's cabinet. That would be the resignation of Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks. One report suggests that Weeks is being squeezed out as a result of a speech he made recently warning of the dangers involved in lowering American tariff barriers. As is evident, the White House and State Department are pushing a movement to abolish or drastically lower tariffs. The Weeks' speech seemed to constitute defiance of this official aim. It is also rumored that, should Weeks go, his place would be taken by Walter Williams, who led the Citizens for Eisenhower clubs during the campaign.

● Wall Street circles showed keen interest during the past week in the sale by Soviet Russia of $60,000,000 of gold bullion to Britain. The action was linked with the approaching date when Britain is scheduled to pay the U.S. an installment on principal and interest due on the loan which the U.S. made to Britain right after the war. The burning question now is — will the British ask the U.S. to take the Soviet bullion in payment? Do the British need Soviet financial help to pay the U.S.? Whatever the answers to these questions — Wall Street agrees that the Soviet move was calculated, that Moscow could have just as well sold the gold in Zurich or Tangiers, that the objective was to present a picture of closer relations, to say the least, between the United Kingdom and the USSR, and therefore a division between the U.K. and the U.S.

● One tidbit that has amused this protocol-conscious town concerns the new status of Mr. Henry Luce, publisher of *Time*, *Life* and *Fortune* magazines and virtual creator of the term "tycoon". His wife, known as Claire Boothe Luce, is presently Ambassador to Italy. Mr. Luce when asked out to dinner was informed that, because of his wife, he would enjoy precedence over a Minister, but not over an Ambassador. In short, he must sit "below" his wife in rank at a dinner table.

Mantle of Taft: Who will assume the role long occupied by Senator Taft — this is a question which has remained unanswered since the death of the man who for years had been the real leader of the main part of the Republican Party, and of a large part of the American people. The question has nothing to do with who is the floor leader of the GOP in the Senate. Senator Knowland, now in that position, obviously does not possess the standing or intellectual ability to fill Taft's place as a popular leader. Neither Bricker nor Jenner has shown any disposition to take the role.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Until recently, Senator McCarthy was not thoought of in this respect because he kept rather sedulously to the issue of Communists in Government. Taft's moral prestige rested largely on his courageous, independent views on foreign policy — and the country always hung on these words of his. Early in December, however, McCarthy departed from his favorite issue of Communism in his famous TV address.

He criticized the Eisenhower Administration for soft treatment of its allies and demanded that the Administration withhold foreign aid to those allies which send strategic goods behind the Iron Curtain. In this, McCarthy expressed the sense of the Congress when in 1952 it passed a law to that effect. As usual, the bulk of the press and pundits showered abuse on the Senator's head (as, indeed, they so often had done to Taft when he spoke as frankly) and the Secretary of State expressed his disapproval of any attempt to "coerce" our allies.

Yet, shortly after, on December 14, Mr. Dulles made a speech threatening the French with loss of our economic aid unless Paris ratified the European Defense Community pact, which would enable Germany to rearm. The French thought this speech of Dulles was "coercive".

The upshot is that McCarthy has entered a new field of controversy, foreign affairs, and presumably not without some concrete effects on the Administration's deportment; for Dulles proceeded to try to "coerce" one of our allies. In short, the Senator has taken a long stride on the trail blazed by Senator Taft.

Will McCarthy follow this up? If he does, he could become by far the most powerful political leader in the nation.

Patronage: The resentment among Republicans in general on the matter of Federal patronage is in large part anger at seeing New Deal Democrats remain on the Federal payroll rather than disappointment that Republicans do not replace them. But the discontent with the Eisenhower Administration's appointments runs deep in the ranks of the party workers and may have a disastrous effect in next year's elections.

For example, Missouri is stirred by the fact that the Eisenhower Administration has just given a big patronage plum to a long-time stalwart of the Missouri Democratic Party. The job is a judgeship on the United Nations Tribunal; the man appointed (over a faithful Republican recommended for the job) is Jacob M. Lashly, a St. Louis attorney and long-time Democrat. In the 1952 campaign, he worked zealously for the defeat of Eisenhower and the GOP ticket in Missouri. Washington takes a special interest because Lashly was a former law partner of Clark Clifford, for some years Administrative Assistant to President Truman.

The appointment was followed by a public announcement from Mr. Glenn Weber, long a big figure in the Missouri GOP, that he was resigning from the Party and would support the Democrats in the next election. Weber led the Missouri delegation in the GOP convention in 1952 at Chicago to the support of Eisenhower. Those who know him say this shift was really caused by his disgust at the appointment of the Democrat Lashly.

Some Republicans describe the Lashly affair as perhaps a "death blow" to the GOP in Missouri. Since 1940, the Republicans had made quite a come-back in that state, which was normally Democratic, electing a governor, several senators and in one congress a majority of the House delegation. It is not difficult to understand the disappointment of GOP workers faithful to the party for many years when they get such news as Lashly's appointment. It is remarked that — if the election were held today — Missouri would not send a single Republican to Congress.

County Rights: The call for Federal aid by state officials is so regular that the rejection of money offered by the U.S. Treasury is news of major importance. That is exactly what the Commissioners of Harrison County, Ohio, did. Declaring that the county was well able to take care of any relief problems in their domain, they refused to take the $7,200 allotted to it by the Federal Welfare Department. And

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they supported their unusual position with the equally unusual but sound argument that the money they refused would cost the taxpayers of the country nearly three times the amount.

Under the Federal law, however, it is obligatory for the Commissioners to take what is offered them; if they persist in refusing the money, the Washington government may refuse to send any "welfare" money to Ohio, and the counties outside of Harrison do not like the prospect. Latest reports are that the matter will be taken to court.

It is interesting to speculate on the effect of a general refusal by state officials to take any money from Washington. The bureaucrats would find themselves in the unenviable position of having nothing to do, and with lots of money to do it with. Since there would be no tables of statistics to draw up, about all they could do with their time and money would be to publish pleas to the country on what they could do for the people if only the people would let them. Or, they could commiserate with one another at cocktail parties all day long. It is hardly likely that the government would take the hint and drop the "welfare" program and all the tax income.

A Southern View: Homer G. Richey, a radio commentator (on WINC, WRFL, Winchester, Va., WSSO, Starkville, Miss., and WRBC, Jackson, Miss.) remarks in a recent broadcast that the Eisenhower Administration has "tossed away another bloc of votes", when Attorney General Brownell offered his brief to the Supreme Court attacking segregation in schools. "The ability", says Richey, "of the Eisenhower Administration demonstrated thus far to lose friends and alienate people is so extraordinary as to be almost unbelievable."

Richey proceeds to think out loud in a way which, if symptomatic of thinking in the South, could portend a party realignment. "Eisenhower has repudiated the very people who elected him. He has gone over to the radicals, the carpet-baggers and the scalawags, has become a 'sounding board and a tinkling cymbal'. This has caused great unhappiness among the conservatives in his own party. Here too are people who have been deceived and repudiated. They are just as forlorn and homeless as are we Southerners."

Then a concrete proposal: "Now with this situation obtaining, why cannot these good Americans, Southern Democrats and conservative Northern Republicans get together in a new party? . . . Take men like the Senators and Representatives from my own home State of Virginia. These men have seen their political fortunes and careers bound up with the fortunes of the National Democratic Party for so long they are afraid to take any step which they fear may jeopardize their staying in office. The notable exception was the action of Harry Byrd and Bill Tuck last year in repudiating the Stevenson-Sparkman ticket. On the floors of Congress our Southern representatives act very courageously for the most part, and it is due to their alliance with conservative Republicans that this country is not much further along the road toward a socialist-communist welfare state than it is. But back home things are different. Come election time these men swing obediently into line behind the national Democratic Party like a herd of sheep.

"I do not know", he concludes, "how much of an earthquake it will take to shake these men loose from old party ties and loyalties. One thing would change them, I know. That would be for enough people in the South, everyday, ordinary citizens, to get together into an effective political organization *outside* the national Democratic and Republican Parties and serve notice on these senators and representatives that further supine yielding to the dictates of the national party means political death at the polls."

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED